

February 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A607

local leadership and the county's State and Federal representatives has produced a working model that can easily set an example for the Nation.

Tonight the citizens of Orange County are honoring one of the men who really make the federal system work—David Baker.

Mr. Baker serves as one of the five members of Orange County's board of supervisors. In the fastest growing county in the Nation, Mr. Baker, working in concert with all levels of government, has been instrumental in meeting the myriad of complicated problems faced by the area. Orange County's success in effectively meeting the challenge of its phenomenal growth rate is to a great extent due to the creative and energetic talents of David Baker employing creative federalism.

Mr. Baker moved to Orange County in 1950 and soon was proving his skill in a position with the county's department of building safety. Ever interested in all aspects of community and civic life Mr. Baker has been active in the YMCA and the various Scouts' organizations, as well as being a charter member of the Orange County Chapter of the American Institute of Building Design.

Elected to the Orange County Board of Supervisors in 1962, David Baker quickly assumed a role of prominence. He has served as chairman of the board's committees on probation, building services, parks, fish and game, forestry-fire control, and the Coastal Projects Water Committee, among others. He also serves on the Inter-County Committee on Roads, and the Community Action Committee.

His farsighted vision in the area of regional development has been recognized by his southern California colleagues, for he serves as chairman of the Southern California Association of Supervisors' Committee on City-County Relations, and as the interim vice president, secretary-treasurer of the all-important Joint City-County Committee for Southern California Associated Governments Formation.

Mr. Baker has also been prominent in the County Supervisors Association of California, and the National Association of Counties, as well as recently serving as a panelist on Gov. Edmund G. Brown's conference on beauty.

Mr. Baker's tireless effort on behalf of the more than 1 million Orange County residents is evidenced by his recent trip to Washington to meet with me, Secretary Udall and numerous other Government officials in order to obtain additional recreational facilities for the expanding population of Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join with my fellow Orange Countians in paying tribute to David Baker. He is an outstanding example of talented, and vigorous young America. His service to Orange County has been guided by the principle that President Johnson so eloquently articulated when he said:

It is the genius of our Constitution that under its shelter of enduring institutions and rooted principles there is ample room for the rich fertility of American political invention.

H.R. 12410

SPEECH
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars—the Spanish-American War and World War I—I always have felt a warm closeness to the cause of the veterans.

Today I am glad to join with my colleagues in support of H.R. 12410 and in commendation of its author, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, the great and dedicated chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This good measure will provide educational and other readjustment benefits to the men and women of our armed services after the Korean war. Included in its coverage are those who now are engaged in the bloody conflict with communism in Vietnam. I know of no measure that possibly could be received by the entire membership of this House with a greater depth of approving sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that at this session of the 89th Congress legislation will be enacted giving to all the veterans of World War I a pension comparable to that which Congress in its wisdom and patriotic generosity some years ago voted to the veterans of the war with Spain.

The cruel fact is that many thousands of the veterans of World War I are unable to meet the high cost of living on pensions, many as low as \$78 a month. Many without any pensions at all are in miserable need. These are the men and women who in their youth offered their all in the cause of the country of their affection. It is revolting to any sense of decency and contrary to any conception of common gratitude that they should continue to go unaided and unattended by the Republic they served.

I earnestly call upon the fine and virile organization of the Veterans of World War I to drive with all its strength for the enactment of its bill at this session of the Congress and to that drive I pledge my full support.

There was no such thing as a bill of rights for World War I veterans and they had a hard time getting back on their feet after discharge in 1919 and 1920. In giving my enthusiastic support to legislation for the returning veterans of World War II and the Korean war, and in supporting this bill with all my heart, I am not unmindful that there is still much to be done for the remaining veterans of World War I that in some measure could make amends for the neglect of the past. I urge the great Veterans' Affairs Committee to give its immediate and intensive attention to this end.

Mr. Speaker, I think it not inappropriate at this time to include in my remarks on H.R. 12410 my speech on June

26, 1958, when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as the last Spanish War veteran in this body, I feel that my comrades in a conflict of six decades ago would wish me to speak. I am giving full and enthusiastic support to this bill. I commend the great Judiciary Committee for reporting out a measure calculated at long last to bring the veterans of World War I into their own organization with the dignity, prestige, and authority of a charter granted by the Congress of the United States.

Illinois is proud that she is the birth State of the Grand Army of the Republic, which set the pattern of veterans of one war being banded in an organization to serve God, country, and the veteran cause as long as any of the veterans of that war remained alive, and then to go the way of all things human. In supporting this bill I am responding to the spirit of Illinois and the sentiment of her people.

For many years after the close of the Civil War it was the Union veterans banded in the Grand Army of the Republic that carried in every northern State and in every northern city and village the banner of veteran solidarity and of the patriotism that has its highest expression in the veterans who have fought together in their youth for the country of their love.

Then, while many in the Grand Army of the Republic were still alive and active, came the war with Spain and after that conflict the forming and the chartering of the United Spanish War Veterans. As the years passed and death thinned the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic, the service of taking over fell to the United Spanish War Veterans.

There had been a link between the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans by reason of the fact that many who had fought in the War of the States, both on the northern and on the southern side, fought again in the war with Spain. They were a little older in years but still young in patriotism. There were members of the Grand Army of the Republic who also were members of the United Spanish War Veterans. Each veteran organization had its own work to do.

When World War I came the Grand Army of the Republic, to a large extent, had been replaced by the United Spanish War Veterans. The Grand Army of the Republic, even though its ranks had been decimated by the passage of years, continued still to function, but its chores were passed on to the younger man who had fought in the war with Spain.

The Grand Army of the Republic now is gone. It will be remembered with affection in all the years ahead and its history will be an inspiration to all the generations to come. Soon the United Spanish War Veterans will have gone its way, its camps closed, its books and records turned over to history and its last member resting in the grave of an American soldier, sailor, or marine.

I am deeply moved to contemplate that the place of the veterans' organizations that have united those who served the Union in the Civil War and those who served in the war with Spain is to be taken over by a veteran organization chartered by the Congress of the United States, and memberships in which is confined exclusively to those who served in World War I and were honorably discharged at the completion of their service.

A608

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Conventions file
 August 8, 1966

There will come a day, and it is not too long away considering that the average age today of those eligible is over 65, when the veterans of World War I of the United States will follow the way of the Grand Army of the Republic and of the United Spanish War Veterans. Then will come, I predict, the formation and chartering of the veterans of World War II and at a little later date the organization and chartering of the veterans of the Korean war.

This, Mr. Chairman, follows the American tradition and it conforms with the rule that persons of common experience and common interest are more efficient in their undertakings when they act in unison.

There were many veterans of the war with Spain who served in World War I, and their interest in the United Spanish War Veterans did not diminish when also they became members of veterans organizations that were open to qualified veterans of later wars.

The chartering of the Veterans of World War I of the United States will not in any way dampen the interest or diminish the loyalty of the veterans of its membership to the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which great organizations they also may hold membership. I know that has been true in my case. I have been a member of the United Spanish War Veterans since the very earliest days, and I have been a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during all the years of its existence, and there has never been a moment when my loyalty to one organization made demands upon my loyalty to the other organization. I was among the founders of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, and my loyalty to the United Spanish War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars was only strengthened by my loyalty to the American Legion. My membership in the Veterans of World War I of the United States further strengthens me in my loyalty to these older organizations and in that devotion to country that every man and woman who has ever served in time of war finds is part and parcel of his being.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that when this bill comes up for passage there will be a rollcall in order that all Members may be put on record. I anticipate that every Member who is on the floor will vote for this bill. When they have done that, there is one further thing that they can do to make this a memorable day and prove fidelity to the veteran cause and friendship to the veterans of World War I, all of them now well on the march to the sunset. On the Clerk's desk is a discharge petition to bring to the floor of the House a bill granting to veterans of World War I a pension similar to the Spanish War pension. That petition has been on the Clerk's desk for many days, and there are not too many signatures. The reason I would say is that the Members of the House, engrossed in many legislative duties, have had good intentions but forgetful minds. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this reminder will play some small part in causing an immediate rush to sign the petition.

The veterans of World War I are no longer young. They now constitute the army of veterans that is passing on, just as the Grand Army of the Republic passed on and as soon the United Spanish War Veterans will pass on. Many of them are in need, and with each year as the disabilities of age multiply their need will intensify. We should not wish it said of our country that any of its servitors in time of military peril was left unaided in his age and in his distresses.

Why the United States-U.S.S.R. Consular Treaty Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor of economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, has written a scholarly article on the proposed consular treaty between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the article, in which Dr. Dobriansky discusses three reasons for rejecting the treaty:

II. A DIPLOMATIC AFFIRMATION OF MOSCOW'S INNER EMPIRE

The second reason for rejecting the treaty is that it constitutes a diplomatic affirmation, a stamp of approval and acceptance of Moscow's inner empire. I'm aware of the fact that most Americans cling to the myth that the Soviet Union is Russia, that the U.S.S.R. is a country like ours, indeed, that this inner empire of many nations is a nation like ours. One superficial account of last August's episode misleads readers in this fashion: "If ratified, it would be the first bilateral treaty between the two nations."¹

We can allow for such ignorance in an ordinary newspaper article, but for our leaders of state to believe that the U.S.S.R. is a nation is plainly unpardonable. If we should ever lose the cold war, it would be basically because of this fundamental gap in our understanding of the U.S.S.R. as an empire-state, a prisonhouse of many captive nations, the inner and basic sphere of the present Soviet Russian Empire. Despite other objectives and purposes, both Napoleon and Hitler lost hot wars in this area of eastern Europe because of substantially the same gap in understanding.

This fallacious notion of the U.S.S.R. as a country and other basic myths are reflected in the convention, which of course cannot but satisfy the propaganda and psychopolitical efforts of Moscow to the utmost. The treaty is founded on the mythical conception that the U.S.S.R. is a nation-state comparable in character to ours. American consulates in any of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. would tangibly reinforce this myth, needlessly abet Russian policies aimed at unifying this primary imperium, and thus nullify any leverage for peace we may have in at least recognizing the freedom goals of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

In the past 45 years the United States has committed many shortsighted errors bolstering and strengthening this inner empire of Soviet Russia. Ratification of this treaty would add another chapter to this sordid record. In a letter to Senator FULBRIGHT, the writer emphasized this point when he stated, "a blind ratification of the convention would form another chapter in our long, inept dealings with the Russians and expose us to the charge of being a nation of hypocrites when

Footnotes at end of speech.

the President and others proclaim our "devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty. This treaty is a confirmation of Russia's imperio-colonialism within the U.S.S.R. and further evidence of our diplomatic ineptitude in the cold war, not to say our grave lack of understanding of America's prime enemy."² In terms of power and ambition, we delude ourselves if we think Peiping rather than Moscow is the prime enemy.

Before taking action on the treaty it would profit each Senator to read a recent official study prepared for one of the Senate's own committees on the empire within the U.S.S.R. "Western scholars of Soviet affairs," it observes, "agree on the imperial-colonial character of the U.S.S.R."³ Commendable as it is, even this study doesn't cover all aspects of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in the U.S.S.R.. For succinct, deep insights into this inner empire each Senator would do well to read Adlai Stevenson's remarkable memorandum on the subject in the United Nations.⁴ After reading these he would have to ask himself, "Could I, as a Senator, representing people in a democracy and Republic dedicated to principles of national independence and self-determination, vote for a treaty which explicitly and implicitly misrepresents a state and, in effect, places a stamp of approval on a tyrannical empire?" Each in his own conscience would have to answer this question.

This reason for not ratifying the treaty is basic to all others. It hinges on the most fundamental issue of the contemporary struggle—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism versus freedom and national independence. It offers us another opportunity to fill in the gap of American understanding of the U.S.S.R. The first was Congress' Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90) in 1959, which for the first time recognized the freedom aspirations of all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Ratification of the treaty would contradict the very essence and spirit of that resolution. Also, Secretary Rusk and others argue that the treaty would improve communications between the two countries. Aside from the rudimentary fact that it is hardly within the purview of consular activity to communicate or negotiate between countries, what improvement in communications could be achieved between the United States and the many nations in the U.S.S.R. under a treaty which slights and ignores the presence of all but one of these nations? To our own detriment, the very opposite would be achieved.

III. LEGAL INVALIDITIES OF THE TREATY

A third substantial reason for rejecting the treaty is its numerous legal invalidities. If some of our lawmakers in the Senate still find the second reason difficult to grasp at this point, surely the legal contradictions and invalidities of the pact would fall more readily within their immediate attention. In a court of law any patent misrepresentation of parties to a contract or blatant contradictions to fact would be sufficient to throw the case out of court. The consular treaty is pitted exactly in this situation.

Throughout the text of the treaty one reads about "a national of the sending state."⁵ This makes sense in the case of the United States, a citizen of a nation generally called about the world "an American." Who is the national of the Soviet Union? A Russian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and so forth? If language and words have any meaning, a "national" is an individual member of a given nation. On the impenetrable basis of all evidence provided by Moscow itself, the Soviet Union is no nation but